

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/972,949	10/10/2001	Ryutaro Oka	Q66636	4803	
7590 12/18/2003 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS			EXAMINER		
			SY, MARIANO ONG		
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3683		
			DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		, 1					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Community	09/972,949	OKA, RYUTARO	-				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_				
;	Mariano Sy	3683					
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30). - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statu. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply set or extended	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of the tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO III, by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>20 November 2003</u> .						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b))⊠ This action is non-final.						
Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 2-5 is/are pending in the app	lication.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,4 and 5</u> is/are rejected.							
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3</u> is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.	·					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objecti							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	by the Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International	ocuments have been received. ocuments have been received in a the priority documents have been	Application No					
* See the attached detailed Office action 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for since a specific reference was included a 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language.	for a list of the certified copies no domestic priority under 35 U.S.C in the first sentence of the specific	. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) cation or in an Application Data Sheet.					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for reference was included in the first senter	domestic priority under 35 U.S.C	. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTCB) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper	D-948) 5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) .					
D							

Application/Control Number: 09/972,949

Art Unit: 3683

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Final Rejection filed on July 18, 2003 is hereby withdrawn by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachtigal et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,559,633 B1) in view of French et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,161,962).

Re-claims 2 and 4 Nachtigal et al. discloses, as shown in fig. 1, a rolling bearing assembly having a speed sensor 30, said bearing assembly comprises: a stationary 4 and rotary 2 bearing rings one positioned inside the other; a sealing member 50 secured to the stationary bearing ring; and the sensor secured to the sealing member, wherein the sealing member includes a core metal 20 fitted to the stationary bearing ring, and an elastic member 52 made of one of rubber and resin and integrated together with the core metal and wherein the sensor is secured to the core metal in contact therewith; wherein the sensor is fixed to the sealing member by means of an integral molding of the elastic member with the metal core. However Nachtigal et al. fail to disclose a temperature sensor.

Application/Control Number: 09/972,949

Art Unit: 3683

French et al. teaches bearing with sensor module B that may contain a speed 110, temperature 112, and acceleration sensor 114.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized the known sensor module into the bearing assembly of Nachtigal et al., in view of the teaching of French et al., in order to detect the temperature in the interior of the bearing so as to detect bearing failure.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachtigal et al. in view of French et al. as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Gomez et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,833,371).

Re-claim 5 Nachtigal et al. as modified was silent to disclose the temperature sensor 112 is a chip-type laminar thermistor. Gomez et al. teaches the use of thermistor as temperature sensor in col. 1, lines 35-36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have merely utilized the known thermistor for use as a temperature sensor into the bearing assembly of Nachtigal et al. as modified, in view of the teaching of Gomez et al., in order to get an accurate reading of the temperature inside the bearing depending upon the type of application, cost, and availability.

5. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3683

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariano Sy whose telephone number is 703-308-3427. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder, can be reached on 703-308-3421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

mym,

M. Sy

December 1, 2003

CUPERVISOR METERS MESTAGE TO THE TEST TO T